



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

210

CRM-M-10321-2026

Date of Decision: 21.04.2026

RAMESH @ RIMMI

.....PETITIONER

Vs.

STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER

.....RESPONDENTS

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE NEERJA K. KALSON

Present:- Mr. Gurdarshan S.Sidhu, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Gorav Kathuria, DAG, Punjab.

Mr. Vinay Kumar Gupta, Advocate
for respondent No.2.

NEERJA K. KALSON, J.

1. The present petition has been filed under Section 483 of the Bhartiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanita, 2023 seeking grant of regular bail to the petitioner in case bearing FIR No.151 dated 01.05.2021 (Annexure P-1), under Section 363, 366-A of IPC (Section 376(2) (n) IPC and Section 6 of POCSO Act, 2012 added later on), registered at Police Station Rania, District Sirsa.

2. The petitioner is being prosecuted for having allegedly enticed the complainant's minor daughter.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the present case and the complaint was launched with a malafide intent and ulterior motive to blackmail and pressurize the petitioner. The alleged victim has since been recovered and is presently married to the petitioner and also has one child with him. It is further



contended that the investigation in the present case has been concluded and the challan has already been presented before the learned trial Court, and the material prosecution witnesses have been examined. The prosecutrix, examined as PW-2 before the learned trial Court, has not supported the case of the prosecution and has categorically stated that the petitioner neither kidnapped nor committed rape upon her. Similarly, her brother, who has also been examined before the learned trial Court, has not supported the prosecution case and has specifically denied any involvement of the petitioner in the alleged offence. It is further submitted that the petitioner has been in judicial custody since 10.01.2025 and should be granted the concession of regular bail.

4. Learned State counsel opposes the grant of bail to the petitioner on the ground that he enticed a minor girl.

5. I have heard the learned counsel for the parties and perused the record.

6. Having considered the rival submissions and perused the material on record, this Court finds merit in the contentions raised by learned counsel for the petitioner. The testimony of the prosecutrix, examined as PW-2, does not support the prosecution version and she has not attributed any incriminating role to the petitioner. Likewise, the deposition of her brother also does not advance the case of the prosecution and he has not implicated the petitioner in the alleged occurrence. Further, the prosecutrix is now married to the petitioner and has a child. The investigation stands concluded, challan has been presented, and the petitioner has been in judicial custody since



10.01.2025. In such circumstances, no useful purpose would be served by keeping the petitioner in further incarceration.

7. In view of the above, the present case is considered to be a fit one in which the petitioner be directed to be released on regular bail. Resultantly, subject to the satisfaction of the learned CJM/Duty Magistrate, the petitioner is directed to be released on bail.

8. It is clarified that the above observations have been made only for the limited purpose of deciding the present regular bail application and the same shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

(NEERJA K. KALSON)
JUDGE

21.04.2026

pry

| | |
|---------------------------|--------|
| Whether Speaking/reasoned | Yes/No |
| Whether Reportable | Yes/No |